

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR  
THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

|                                      |          |                     |
|--------------------------------------|----------|---------------------|
| <b>DONALD MICHAEL OUTLAW,</b>        | <b>:</b> | <b>CIVIL ACTION</b> |
| <i>Plaintiff,</i>                    | <b>:</b> |                     |
|                                      | <b>:</b> |                     |
| <b>v.</b>                            | <b>:</b> |                     |
|                                      | <b>:</b> | <b>NO. 21-1290</b>  |
| <b>CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,</b>         | <b>:</b> |                     |
| <b>JEFFREY PIREE and HOWARD</b>      | <b>:</b> |                     |
| <b>PETERMAN, in their individual</b> | <b>:</b> |                     |
| <b>capacities,</b>                   | <b>:</b> |                     |
| <i>Defendants.</i>                   | <b>:</b> |                     |

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this **19th** day of **August, 2022**, upon consideration of Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Objections and Compel Defendants' Responses and Produce Responsive Material to Plaintiff's Requests for Productions (ECF No. 122), it is **hereby ORDERED** that the Motion is **DENIED in part** as it relates to Plaintiff's Tenth Set of Requests for Production No. 9, addressed to the City of Philadelphia.

Accordingly, Defense counsel's Response to the Motion (ECF No. 122) need only address the Motion (ECF No. 122) as it pertains to Plaintiff's Tenth Set of Requests for Production Nos. 5 and 7, addressed to the City of Philadelphia, as well as Plaintiff's Second Set of Requests for Production of Documents No. 4, addressed to Howard Peterman.

**BY THE COURT**

/s/ *Chad F. Kenney*

---

**CHAD F. KENNEY, JUDGE**